

「世界におけるアジア」からみた「アジア統合」

篠原初枝

2008/02/08

はじめに

1. 史的展開

- ・ヨーロッパ勢力の進出以前
朝貢体制 vs 主権国家体制
- ・帝国主義—「蚕食されるアジア」、客体としてのアジア
cf. 日本の位置
- ・冷戦・脱植地化—中間領域、AA 会議
勢力拮抗の草狩場、ベトナム戦争、ASEAN、
国家建設と経済成長

2. 外的要因：現代世界におけるアジア

国際政治における共同行動をとりやすい環境なのか？

- ・UN—サミット体制
- ・「アメリカ帝国」
- ・「新しい中世」—EU, ASEM
- ・新たな geo-political configuration—中、印、ロシアの台頭、米の相対的
低下
- ・グローバリゼーション
三船恵美「グローバリゼーションと中国の制度化」『国際政治』132(2003年
2月)
- ・「文明の衝突」、民主主義（人権）

内的要因：多様な政治体制・価値、格差、nationalism, etc

3. 統合のひとつの指標—制度的担保 cf. EU

- ・多国間条約ではなく二国間条約の集積体
『東アジア共同体の構築』第四巻『図説ネットワーク解析』（岩波書店、2006年）
- 低制度（低政治？）・主権温存・域外参入・経済社会主導型国際交流深化体
政策協調は個々の問題においてどれほど進んでいるのか？
低制度は必ずしも低政治ではないのか？—官僚レベル

大庭三枝「東アジアにおける食料安全保障協力の進展」『国際政治』135号（2004
年3月）

- ・最近の動向—東南アジア友好協力条約の拡大、
現加盟国22カ国—ASEAN10カ国、中、韓、日(04)、モンゴル、ロ
シア、印度、パキスタン、NZ、豪、パプアニューギニア、東ティモール、
フランス（2007年1月13日署名、西欧で初の調印国）

4. 交流の深化

- 1) 制度化へ進みつつあるのか
経済・社会と政治要因が独立する傾向—機能主義があてはまらない？
北東アジアという薄氷地帯
- 2) 各国の開放につながるか—ex. 文化、労働ビザ

Table 6. Relative Shares of World Manufacturing Output, 1750-1900

	1750	1800	1830	1860	1880	1900
(Europe as a whole)	23.2	28.1	34.2	53.2	61.3	62.0
United Kingdom	1.9	4.3	9.5	19.9	22.9	18.5
Habsburg Empire	2.9	3.2	3.2	4.2	4.4	4.7
France	4.0	4.2	5.2	7.9	7.8	6.8
German States/Germany	2.9	3.5	3.5	4.9	8.5	13.2
Italian States/Italy	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.5
Russia	5.0	5.6	5.6	7.0	7.6	8.8
United States	0.1	0.8	2.4	7.2	14.7	23.6
Japan	3.8	3.5	2.8	2.6	2.4	2.4
Third World	73.0	67.7	60.5	36.6	20.9	11.0
China	32.8	33.3	29.8	19.7	12.5	6.2
India/Pakistan	24.5	19.7	17.6	8.6	2.8	1.7

Paul Kennedy,
The Rise and Fall of
Great Powers

Table 7. Per Capita Levels of Industrialization, 1750-1900 (relative to U.K. in 1900 = 100)

	1750	1800	1830	1860	1880	1900
(Europe as a whole)	8	8	11	16	24	35
United Kingdom	10	16	25	64	87	[100]
Habsburg Empire	7	7	8	11	15	23
France	9	9	12	20	28	39
German States/Germany	8	8	9	15	25	52
Italian States/Italy	8	8	8	10	12	17
Russia	6	6	7	8	10	15
United States	4	9	14	21	38	69
Japan	7	7	7	7	9	12
Third World	7	6	6	4	3	2
China	8	6	6	4	4	3
India	7	6	6	3	2	1

ANALYSIS

U.S. firms find suing Chinese companies no easy matter

By Jeffrey Gold
The Associated Press

NEWARK, N.J.—When a U.S. scooter maker lost patience with cheaper Chinese-made models flooding the United States market, it got some attention by filing an antitrust lawsuit.

Patmont Motor Werks Inc. accused the Chinese government and companies there of making it impossible for the Minden, Nev.-based company to sell its products to China. One aim of the lawsuit was to open China's doors to U.S.-made products.

That improbable goal is now in ashes, after Patmont's lawyers could not even track down the companies they were suing to serve them court papers.

An increasing number of companies and individuals are likely to face similar frustration. The flood of Chinese imports has triggered a growing number of lawsuits, but individuals and companies often find it impossible to win damages or other legal redress, especially for lawsuits filed overseas.

Foreign companies are also filing lawsuits in Chinese courts, and occasionally winning, against local companies caught violating trademarks, copyrights and patents.

The legal obstacles are unlikely to be removed soon, although China has pledged to curb its mounting trade surpluses with the

United States and has carried out a nationwide campaign to improve product quality and safety.

Within a decade, however, China is likely to conform more closely to international legal standards, said Gary Hufbauer, a China expert at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, a Washington think tank. "The drift is clearly toward a normalized situation," he said.

Current obstacles arise because the targets of lawsuits are often companies that are partly owned by the Chinese government or army, or are allied with provincial governors, said Hufbauer. As a result, their clout can outweigh efforts by the trade ministry to adhere to international agreements, he said.

In addition, he said the Chinese government sometimes obstructs litigation to retaliate when it thinks the United States or the European Union is "poking it with a stick."

Washington's growing impatience over Chinese trade practices has prompted dozens of retaliatory bills in Congress, as the U.S. trade deficit with China for 2007 is expected to exceed a record \$250 billion. The U.S. lawmakers view 2008—when China hosts the Olympics—as an opportunity to highlight their grievances.

Experts in international law say they know of no case in which Americans col-

lected any money from a verdict or court order against a Chinese company, although some have been paid through settlements.

A federal judge dismissed the Patmont lawsuit 2½ years after it was filed because Patmont had been unable to deliver the lawsuit to the defendants, as court rules require.

The failure was not for lack of trying, said a Patmont lawyer, Brian Irvine.

"It's like the Whac-A-Mole game. Once you serve them at one address, you get a letter back saying they're not there," Irvine said.

Patmont founder Steven Patmont said the lawsuit convinced some U.S. companies to stop selling the Chinese-made knockoffs, but that China has failed to adhere to trade agreements and his company has barely survived a tenfold drop in sales since 2000.

While the number of lawsuits pending is not available, experts say lawsuits against Chinese companies are proliferating, asserting claims of product piracy, impure ingredients and unsafe products.

"My sense is, we're just seeing the tip of the iceberg," said Michael Lyle, a Washington-based lawyer at Weil, Gotshal & Manges who represents companies in product liability and trade cases. "Because of our global economy, and the fact that China is a major player, you're going to be seeing

more of these cases." Most Chinese companies have no assets in the United States, so they have no trouble ignoring a U.S. court order.

"There's no treaty between the United States and China that requires the enforcement of each other's judgments," said Lyle, a former White House official.

China is a signatory to an international accord known as the Hague Convention, but does not accept all of the treaty's articles.

The expansion of Chinese companies into global markets, with offices and operations in the United States and elsewhere, could give them greater an incentive to cooperate in legal proceedings, Lyle said.

But until then, Chinese companies will assert that U.S. courts have no jurisdiction.

Indeed, every step in litigation can be an ordeal when the defendant is a Chinese company, said Peter Antonucci, a lawyer at Greenberg Traurig in New York who has consulted for Chinese companies.

Lawyers said Chinese authorities often cannot locate the accused companies because the firms are often dissolved and the factory put in the hands of a new company.

"It's very expensive, very expensive and very time-consuming. The fastest I've ever seen it done is three months," Antonucci said. In the United States, service occurs within a few days.

India may work on missile defense with U.S.

WASHINGTON (Reuters)—Lockheed Martin Corp., the Pentagon's No. 1 supplier, has been told India may be ready to look into possible U.S.-Indian collaboration on ballistic missile defense, a top company official said Wednesday.

"I would not be surprised if over the next couple of months we begin to have some exploratory discussions with various members of the government and with Indian industry," Richard Kirkland, Lockheed Martin's top executive on South Asia, said in a telephone interview.

Indian missile-defense cooperation with the United States could complicate relations with China, Russia and Pakistan.

Until now, India's policy has been to develop its missile shield domestically, closing a potential multibillion-dollar market to Boeing Co., Lockheed, Raytheon Co. and Northrop Grumman Corp.—the biggest players in the emerging ground, air, sea and space based U.S. missile defense system.

But this may be changing in line with a "watershed" Indian decision, made formal last week, to buy Lockheed's C-130J military transport aircraft, Kirkland said.

India signed a deal with the United States on Jan. 31 to buy six C-130Js worth about \$1 billion, a shift from its

previous heavy reliance on Russian transport planes.

"This kind of puts us in a new environment," James Clad, deputy assistant U.S. defense secretary for South and Southeast Asia, said in an interview Tuesday of the C-130J deal. "With this sale, India is telling us it's ready to buy top-quality U.S. equipment on its merits."

More than 50 U.S. companies doing defense-related work are now represented in India, which is shaping up to be one of the world's biggest arms importers, Clad said.

The United States has been eager to boost strategic ties with India as a precaution against China's growing military power.

Nicholas Burns, the No. 3 U.S. State Department official, wrote in the November/December issue of the journal Foreign Affairs that in reaching out to India, the United States was betting on democracy and market economics rather than "despotism and state planning," an apparent swipe at communist-ruled China.

Nathan Hughes, military analyst for Staffor, a private intelligence firm specialized in geopolitics and security, said any major expansion of U.S.-Indian strategic ties would anger archrival Pakistan; Russia, long a key military supplier; and China.

Daily Yomiuri

2/8/2008